

MAR 1952

50X1-HUM

CLASSIFICATION C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L  
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY  
INFORMATION FROM  
FOREIGN DOCUMENTS OR RADIO BROADCASTS

REPORT

CD NO.

COUNTRY USSR  
SUBJECT Military - Military science  
HOW PUBLISHED Daily newspaper  
WHERE PUBLISHED Moscow, USSR  
DATE PUBLISHED 30 Aug 1955  
LANGUAGE Russian

DATE OF INFORMATION 1955

DATE DIST. 15 Nov 1955

NO. OF PAGES 8

SUPPLEMENT TO REPORT NO.

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS INFORMATION AFFECTING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE OF THE UNITED STATES, WITHIN THE MEANING OF TITLE 18, SECTIONS 793 AND 794, OF THE U.S. CODE, AS AMENDED. ITS TRANSMISSION OR REVELATION OF ITS CONTENTS TO OR RECEIPT BY AN UNAUTHORIZED PERSON IS PROHIBITED BY LAW. THE REPRODUCTION OF THIS FORM IS PROHIBITED.

THIS IS UNEVALUATED INFORMATION

SOURCE Krasnaya ZvezdaSOVIET AND BOURGEOIS MILITARY SCIENCE

[Comment: The following is the complete text of an article by Maj Gen Ye. Boltin, Candidate of Military Science. Boltin is a prolific writer, having written on such themes as the lessons to be drawn from the history of the world wars, the rearming of the Wehrmacht, and the "position-of-strength" policy. He also addressed the All-Union Conference on Military Artistic Literature on 31 May 1955, at about which time the Soviet press began carrying articles calling for a re-evaluation of the history of the war and a new perspective in writing novels and stories (artistic literature) about the armed forces.

Boltin's present article is interesting in that he credits bourgeois military science with the ability also to solve problems of war and armies and admits that bourgeois military science and Soviet military science have certain features in common, including a similar historical development. As can be seen, many of Boltin's statements are direct contradictions to past Soviet statements and principles, and he gives only a cursory treatment of the "constantly operating factors which determine the outcome of war." Stalin's role in developing Soviet and "Stalinist" military science is not mentioned at all.]

The task of any true science is to reveal the regularity of the studies phenomena, form laws on the bases of these phenomena, and teach the people to use these laws. Soviet military science throws light on the objective laws of armed struggle, meanwhile taking into account economic and morale factors, and developing on these bases the most perfect methods of waging war and conducting military operations (deystviya), and also the forms and methods of organizing and training the armed forces.

3-7-6620

11/5

2211 N

10111 N

- 1 -

CLASSIFICATION C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

STATE	NAVY	NSRB	DISTRIBUTION			
ARMY	AIR	FBI				

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

50X1-HUM

Remembering the great Lenin's precept, that without science it is impossible to build a modern army, the Communist Party laid the foundation for the construction of the Soviet Army and Navy, for their utilization in battle, and for the education and training of the personnel. These were done in accordance with true scientific principles based on the all-triumphant theory of Marxism-Leninism and the experience of the class struggle of the proletariat, and also on the experience of past wars and on contemporary achievements in the development of military matters (delo).

Soviet military science developed along with the growth and consolidation of the Soviet state and with the strengthening of our Armed Forces, and in its own turn assisted in every possible way their development and their victories in the struggle against the numerous enemies of our Motherland.

## I

The Communist Party teaches our military cadres -- who are further developing Soviet military science -- not to forget the existence of bourgeois military science and to credit it with the ability to solve the problems of conducting combat operations and war as a whole.

Bourgeois military science exists just as the capitalistic system which gave it birth exists. It is impossible to imagine contemporary capitalism -- with its own peculiar enormous concentration of production and high level of technology -- not utilizing the achievements of science. It is even more impossible to imagine the existence of imperialism without military science, since the entire system of rule by large capitalist states over dependent and exploited peoples is based on coercion and the application of military force. The history of capitalism is full of predatory, aggressive wars which had as their goal the conquest and robbery of other peoples and the repartition of the world. Such wars became a particularly frequent phenomenon during the epoch of imperialism.

In order to conduct aggressive, predatory wars, the imperialistic states create armed forces, and the military leaders and commanders of the capitalist armies study the laws of armed struggle, striving to understand to the necessary degree the interdependence and interrelation of the various phenomena of war. They work out problems of military theory and of the ways and means of combat operations.

Recognizing the existence of bourgeois military science and its ability to solve questions of theory and practical military matters, we also cannot deny that between it and Soviet military science there exists a number of common features.

Their resemblance or common ground is explained in the first place by the fact that Soviet as well as bourgeois military science -- the first to a greater, and the second to a lesser, degree -- reflect the general objective laws of armed struggle. Both military sciences have the problem of mass armies; both use basically the same technical means of armed struggle; and both pay attention to the achievements of science and technology -- not only in their own countries, but in other countries as well. This, of course, cannot help but be reflected -- and this reflection is in many ways similar -- in the contents of both our own military science and the military science of the capitalist countries.

Soviet military science has the same predecessors, and utilized to a considerable extent the same sources, as contemporary military science in the capitalist countries. For example, in the formation of our military theory a determining role was played by the military experience of the 19th and 20th

- 2 -

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

50X1-HUM

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

centuries, and in particular the experience of World War I (1914-1918). This experience is also used by bourgeois military science. The development of Soviet military science during the last decade is based on the experience of World War II, and especially of the Great Patriotic War [i.e., that portion of World War II in which the Soviet Union was engaged]. The military science of the imperialistic states also attentively studies, and profits by, this experience. It is natural that both Soviet military science and bourgeois military science very often, and at the same time, find identical or similar methods of solving practical military problems, since the bases of these solutions lie within the laws of the phenomena of war.

One such law is the necessity to conduct contemporary armed struggle with mass armies, and to achieve victory by the efforts of all branches of the armed forces: ground, sea, and air. This law was clearly established by Soviet military science at the dawn of its development on the basis of the experience of World War I and the Civil War. Certain representatives of bourgeois military science have for many years tried to ignore this law. Out of this came the one-sided, unscientific conceptions of Douhet, Fuller, and their like, who sought a "recipe for victory" in the development and use of one specific [branch of the] armed forces, or even one specific type of troops, and in the utilization of small professional "armies of knights," etc. These very erroneous ideas lie at the basis of several contemporary bourgeois military theories, such as the theory of "push-button warfare," "atomic blitzkrieg," etc.

However, the official doctrines of the contemporary armies of the capitalist countries are by no means confined to these extreme views. For example, in the largest capitalist countries attention is paid to the development of all the branches of the armed forces, types of troops, and methods of combat. Evidence of this lies in such facts as the creation in these countries of mass armies, reorganization of higher military departments (upravleniya), securing unity of command over all branches of the armed forces, and the wide practice of joint exercises and maneuvers by ground forces, aviation, the navy, airborne troops, antiair defense [forces], etc.

It is well known that during the postwar years the technical equipping of armies has significantly increased. New means of mass destruction have appeared. Radar, television, supersonic aircraft, and pilotless means of combat have found wider application. Bourgeois military science considers all these changes. It works out new principles for conducting combat operations, solves problems of organizing and conducting landings by large sea and air forces, problems of coordination of the various branches of the armed forces and types of troops, and works out methods of directing troops in battle and in operations (v boyu i operatsii).

It is impossible to admit with conclusiveness the statements sometimes appearing in our press that contemporary bourgeois military science overestimates the role of materiel (tekhnika) and underestimates the role of personnel (chelovek) and the role of troop morale, on the course and outcome of war. Of course, certain bourgeois theorists are inclined to consider this or that type of weapon the deciding factor in war. But the majority of the bourgeois military scientists -- and among these the most notable -- are forced to admit, and do admit, that the main force on the field of battle is the man who possesses definite morale-combat qualities. Was this not proved, for example, in General Ridgway's statement, "In the final analysis success or failure in war depends on the soldier?"

One must note that it is characteristic of many bourgeois military scientists, when speaking of the role of the soldier and troop morale, to refer to the experience of World War II. The generals of the Fascist German Army, which was thoroughly beaten by the Soviet Army, are particularly zealous in this respect. Thus, in 1953, a book was published in West Germany concerning the

- 3 -

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

50X1-HUM

C-O N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

results of World War II, written by nearly 30 of Hitler's generals. This book also contains an article by the not unknown, deceased Guderian. Speaking of the reviving significance of troop morale in war, Guderian frankly called on his colleagues (yedinomyshlenniki -- those thinking the same), "to train their commanders and soldiers at least to the equal of the Soviets." He also wrote: "Russian generals and soldiers are disciplined. In the most difficult situations of 1941 they did not surrender willingly. Their steadfastness has been demonstrated throughout history. Thus, we must train the soldier to be steadfast and persistent. Laxity in this matter will wreak vengeance only upon yourselves."

It is quite clear that steadfastness, persistence, and the other morale-combat qualities of troops do not come from the sky; they depend on many factors, first and foremost of which are socioeconomic conditions, the aims of war, etc. But now it is important to emphasize another factor. From the examples given it is clear that bourgeois military scientists and military science are forced to consider what great significance the morale of troops has in war, and they draw practical conclusions from this.

All these facts testify that bourgeois military science is capable of considering the objective laws of contemporary war, which imperiously present their own requirements for practical military construction and the development of military art. The problem of our military cadres is to study the strong and weak points of bourgeois military science and the purposes for its development.

However, in investigating the strong and weak points of bourgeois military science, one must not place a sign of equality between it and Soviet military science. Between them there are -- and this cannot be otherwise -- differences in principle.

## II

The fundamental differences between Soviet military science and bourgeois military science are determined, first of all, by the class nature and sociopolitical direction of the former.

It is known that the class nature and sociopolitical direction of military science depends entirely and completely on the character of the social structure.

Bourgeois military science is inseparable from capitalism, which produced it and took it into its service. Its aims, as shown by experience, is to place in the hands of the imperialist armies and their leaders a definite amount of knowledge for the realization of aggressive plans. In this is the reactionary, sociopolitical direction of bourgeois science.

The Soviet structure is really a structure of the people. Predatory, aggressive warfare is alien to its very nature. The Soviet state is interested in peaceful development. However, from the very beginning of its existence the imperialists have tried to prevent peaceful construction in our country and to destroy the socialist home of the workers. Therefore, the Soviet state was forced to go to war to defend its freedom and independence, bringing about the decisive defeat of the aggressor. Those wars are just and liberating which have as their aim the guarding of the historical achievements of our people and the securing of the state interests of the USSR.

- 4 -

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

50X1-HUM

Waging just, liberating war, our state and our military cadres utilized the objective laws of war and armed struggle which are recognized and explained by Soviet military science.

Consequently, Soviet military science is called upon to serve -- and does serve -- the vital interests of the people's mass and the socialist state. It is inspired by the goals of defending the socialist Fatherland, and of freedom, democracy, and socialism. This science cannot be hostile to the people, neither by its contents, nor by its political nature, since it serves the interests of the people and the socialist structure, and the arming of our Soviet Army, an army of a new type, an army of freed workers and peasants, an army of friendship and brotherhood of the people, an army educated in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

In this, then, is the essence of the progressive sociopolitical direction of Soviet military science.

In this way the character of Soviet military science is conditioned by the very nature of the Soviet structure, the most advanced social state structure. This gives Soviet military science its vital strength, and opens before it the great possibilities for solving the problems of utilizing the mighty economic, morale, and military potentials of the Soviet state for the purpose of achieving victory in a just war against imperialistic aggressors.

The progressive character of Soviet military science appeared with special force during the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union against the Fascist German aggressors. In this war the Soviet social and state structure was victorious, and our armed forces were victorious. In addition, it was a victory for Soviet military science over contemporary bourgeois military science.

Bourgeois military science is reactionary not only in its sociopolitical structure, but also in its world outlook and methodical bases. In interpreting problems of armed struggle, bourgeois military science operates on idealistic, metaphysical philosophy. Therefore, it is contradictory by its very nature: in practice it uses the objective laws of military science, but in theory it interprets them idealistically or ignores them completely when they are not acceptable to the bourgeois.

Attempts to work out the theoretical origin of preparing for and waging war were made long ago, and they were defined as "military science" in the lexicon of man long before our time. It is true that in the past not all bourgeois military theorists admitted the possibility of creating a military science. Some of them examined -- and certain bourgeois theorists even now examine -- the waging of war merely as a field of creativeness of the genius mind of the commander.

Present-day military theorists do not deny that on the basis of preparing for and waging modern war lie several common theoretical origins, but they explain these origins idealistically and metaphysically; they tear them away from the character of war and the social structure which causes this character. It is extremely unprofitable to bourgeois military scientists to connect the problems of waging armed struggle with the social structure of a warring state, or with the real aims of war, since this leads to a conclusion which is unacceptable to the capitalistic system.

Thus, it is known that the masses consciously make sacrifices in overcoming the difficulties of war; they support the war effort of the state to the end only when the aims of war are close to and understood by the masses, and correspond to their class and national interests. It is absolutely evident

- 5 -

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

50X1-HUM

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

that the reactionary capitalistic structure, with its unsolved internal contradictions, its policy of seizure of land at the expense of others, and the enslavement of other peoples, is not capable of ensuring a strong and durable morale potential during the entire period of a war. Therefore, although bourgeois military science understands the significance of the morale factor, it is forced to proceed from false interpretations of the aims of war, and from the false slogans of reactionary, imperialistic propaganda. While creating mass armies the imperialists seek to disguise and conceal from the people the true aims of these armies. Bourgeois military science, which is permeated with the spirit of imperialistic military ideology, racism, neo-Malthusianism, and geopolitics, also hides these aims.

Soviet military science has entirely different ideological-theoretical and philosophical bases. It is based on the firm foundation of the consistent, true, scientific theories of Marxism-Leninism and on the philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism. Guided by the materialistic theories and by Marxist dialectical methods, Soviet military science is capable of deeply understanding the objective laws of war; of accurately defining and teaching the economic, morale, and military possibilities both of our own state and of the enemy's; of revealing the mutual ties and mutual influences of the laws; and of pointing out the path to the most perfect and harmonious utilization of all these possibilities in the interests of victory in war.

The Soviet structure, as the most progressive social and state structure, enjoys the whole-hearted support of the laboring masses. As a result of the victory of socialism in our country there developed such powerful moving forces as the morale-political unity of Soviet society, the friendship of the peoples of the USSR, and Soviet patriotism. The workers of the USSR consider it their sacred duty to defend our socialist Fatherland and its state interests. In the name of defending the country they accomplish feats unprecedented in history. In 1921 V. I. Lenin said: "Morale wise -- not meaning this, of course, from the point of view of abstract morale, but in relation to the real strengths of all classes in all states -- we are stronger than all. This has been proved in fact; this was proved not by words, but by deeds; this has been proved once and very likely, if history takes a certain course, it will be proved more than once."

Soviet military science derives from the decisive morale-political superiority of our state and our armed forces over the capitalist countries and their armies. It stems also from the fact that the Soviet structure is superior to the capitalist structure and to its economic organization. The economic system of socialism creates all the conditions for the maximum mobilization of the economic potential of the country in the interests of defeating an aggressor.

Based on the Marxist-Leninist theory, our military science confidently overcomes obstacles, not only in its methods of perception, but also in its methods of utilizing the objective laws which determine victory in war. This is one of the most important advantages that our military science has over the military science of the capitalist states.

In contrast to bourgeois military science -- which is guided by idealistic philosophy, is inclined to underestimate the role of objective factors in war, and overstates the significance of time factors, foremost that of surprise -- Soviet military science is based on the well-known thesis of the constantly operating factors which determine the outcome of war. Correctly defining the role of the constant factors -- the stability of the rear, the morale of the army, the quantity and quality of divisions, the armament of the army, and the organizing ability of the command cadres -- our military science teaches at the same time the significance in contemporary war of the factor of surprise, and of other temporary factors.

- 6 -

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

50X1-HUM

Soviet military science has a creative character; dogmatism and stereotype are alien to it because in the study of the phenomena of armed struggle it applies the Marxist dialectical method. This method permits the correct understanding of the complex phenomena of war and arms our army and navy cadres with prevision of the course of military events and the trends of their development. Marxist dialectics permits Soviet military art to decide more correctly a number of problems, such as the rational organization of ground, air, and naval forces in relation to the branches of the armed forces and to the several types of troops.

In its concrete contents Soviet military science also has a number of peculiarities which distinguish it from bourgeois military science.

Let us consider as an example, the question of the component parts of military art (voennoye isskustvo). It is well known that an antiquity the division of military art into two fields, strategic and tactical, was established. The first was concerned with waging war as a whole, or with the activities of armed forces in a theater of war; the second dealt with the concrete problems of conducting battle. But even in the wars of the second half of the 19th Century, and especially at the beginning of the 20th Century, a new phenomenon sprang up and developed: the operation, which presented itself as an aggregate of various combat actions combined by a unity of aim, planning, and leadership, and encompassing a definite space and time. Practice also advanced new, organized forms of troops, which conformed to this phenomenon: armies, army groups, fronts, and also operational combined formations (ob'yedineniya) of naval, and most recently, of air forces.

Naturally, bourgeois military science was not able to pass up such a tremendous phenomenon of armed struggle as the operation. The principles of preparing and conducting operations was widely used in the practice of combat actions by the armed forces of the capitalist countries, and this must in no way be underestimated. However, Soviet military science was the first, in the 1920s, to create a satisfactorily harmonious system of viewing the nature and law of operations, which received from us the designation operational art. From then on, operational art occupied a firm place in Soviet military science as the third component of the unified Soviet military art, and as the connecting link between strategy and tactics. This is one of the peculiarities of Soviet military science.

Thus, Soviet military science, based on the true scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism, on the philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism, has an enormous advantage in the matter of scientific cognition and the utilization of the laws of armed struggle.

### III

The progressive character of Soviet military science opens before our military cadres great possibilities and perspectives for developing military theory. However, this does not in itself spontaneously ensure the successful solution of the concrete problems of military theory and military art. This [solution] is achieved as a result of persistent work, and the skillful use by command cadres of the theses and principles with which Soviet military science arms them.

Progress in the field of military affairs is unthinkable without the thorough study and complete assimilation of the experience of the past, and first of all, of the experience of the Great Patriotic War and World War II as a whole. Soviet military science -- which is alien to conservatism, stereotypy, and dogmatism -- creatively generalizes the experience of the past war, generalizes so that on the foundation of this experience elements of the new which is being conceived might develop and have enormous significance in the future.

- 7 -

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

50X1-HUM

But it would be a mistake to believe that it is possible to treat with only one experience of the past. Military equipment is being developed quickly the conditions for waging military operations change, and the structure of all types of armed forces, and the forms and methods of training and educating troops, undergo change. Consequently, military science must continuously develop and improve, all the while illuminating the path to practice, pointing out the correct solution to the urgent problems in the field of combat utilization of troops, of waging war as a whole, and of training the armed forces in peace time. Soviet military science seeks to consider correctly the influence which new material and weapons exert on the methods and forms of conducting armed struggle. This is the difficult but honorable mission of Soviet military science, which is called upon to ensure the continuous perfection of our armed forces.

It is well known that every new large war does not resemble the previous one. Nevertheless, even many outstanding military minds (deyateli) of the past mechanically dispensed their ideas concerning future war on the basis of a past war, which led to unfortunate consequences. This can be clearly seen in the French military doctrine on the eve of World War II, which underestimated aviation and large tank formations (soyedineniya), and with its passive-defense means of conducting combat actions. The conservatism of the military minds of France at that time -- who blindly imitated the antiquated experience of World War I -- and the outdated military theory, were one of the main reasons for the defeat of the French Army in 1940.

Modern bourgeois military science strives to avoid a similar stagnation of thought. It widely raises questions on the utilization of new military equipment, and tries to find new methods of waging war. Soviet military thought must study the real potentialities of the armies and navies of the imperialistic states, and the ability of their military cadres to solve practical problems in the fields of armaments, organization of troops, and leadership on the field of battle. Historical experience teaches the Soviet people and our military cadres to look ahead, to be always prepared for battle with a strong enemy possessing powerful means of combat, modern organization of its armed forces, and a sufficiently high military art.

Soviet military science is not the work of a narrow closed circle of specialists. Its furthest development is unthinkable without the participation of a wide circle of representatives of the Army and Navy, people having rich practical experience, and who have received definite military-theoretical training. For the furthest development of Soviet military science a great deal must be done by the military academies, inside whose walls a qualified professorial-instructorial staff works.

The successful development of Soviet military science is ensured because of the constant concern of the Communist Party -- the organizer and inspirer of all the victories of the Soviet peoples in the building of Communism and the defense of the socialist Fatherland. The party teaches our military cadres not to rest on their achievements, to appraise critically what has already been done, to advance uninterruptedly, and to decide boldly new questions arising out of the practical training and education of troops. Our military cadres are required to utilize completely the existing possibilities of solving important military problems in the interest of the furthest strengthening of the combat might of the Soviet Armed Forces -- the tried and true guardian of the state interests of the socialist Motherland.

- E N D -

- 8 -

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L